



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/797,748	03/09/2004	Roger A. Acey	51302-00002	4003	
45200 7	590 08/25/2005		EXAMINER		
PRESTON GATES & ELLIS LLP 1900 MAIN STREET, SUITE 600			WAX, ROBERT A		
IRVINE, CA	·		PAPER NUMBER		
			1653		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		•			
100	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/797,748	ACEY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert A. Wax	1653			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	. 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Ju	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 July 2005</u> .				
/ 	action is non-final.				
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>26-59</u> is/are pending in the application	١.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>26-59</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to:	The state of the state of	•			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	* '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P1O-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		d in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Coo the attached detailed Office detail for a list	5 5554 55pi55 not 1050if0				
Attachment(s)	•				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		<u>-</u>		

Art Unit: 1653

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Examiner acknowledges that Applicants have now corrected the claim for priority.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 26-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (Biotechnol. Prog. (1998), 14, 5, 667-71) in view of Brook et al. and Summers et al.

This rejection was explained in the previous Office action.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments filed July 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have argued that there is no suggestion to combine the references.

Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is

Art Unit: 1653

some teaching, suggestion or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the suggestion to combine comes from what one of ordinary skill in the art would desire, that is, an improved system for accomplishing what her or she wants to accomplish. Separation of metals with metallothionein was known as shown by Chen et al., Brook et al. provide knowledge of a new metallothionein and Summers et al. establish the equivalence of use of immobilized protein immobilized bacteria producing the protein. Combination of such analogous teachings would instantly occur to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants have also argued that there is no reasonable expectation that the combination would be successful. Examiner points again to Summers et al. who provide just that expectation by their teaching that immobilized protein is interchangeable with immobilized bacteria producing the protein.

Finally, applicants have argued that the references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Examiner must respectfully disagree. When the references are combined the result is teaching of both a method of removing metals as well as a device to accomplish the same purpose.

Conclusion .

No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1653

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Wax whose telephone number is (571) 272-0623. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, between 9:00 AM and 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon P. Weber can be reached on (571) 272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert A. Wax Primary Examiner Art Unit 1653

RAW